

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume VIII, Issue No. X

April 2003

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

American Legal System Is Corrupt Beyond Recognition

By Geraldine Hawkins

The American legal system has been corrupted almost beyond recognition, Judge Edith Jones of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, has told the Federalist Society of Harvard Law School.

She said that the question of what is morally right is routinely sacrificed to what is politically expedient. The change has come because legal philosophy has descended to nihilism.

"The first 100 years of American lawyers were trained on Blackstone, who wrote that: 'The law of nature ... dictated by God himself ... is binding ... in all counties and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all force and all their authority ... from this original.' The Framers created a government of limited power with this understanding of the rule of law - that it was dependent on transcendent religious obligation," said Jones.

She said that the business about all of the Founding Fathers being deists is "just wrong," or "way overblown." She says they believed in "faith and reason," and this did not lead to intolerance.

"This is not a prescription for intolerance or narrow sectarianism," she continued, "for unalienable rights were given by God to all our fellow citizens. Having lost sight of the moral and religious foundations of the rule of law, we are vulnerable to the destruction of our freedom, our equality before the law and our self-respect. It is my fervent hope that this new century will

experience a revival of the original understanding of the rule of law and its roots.

According to the judge, the first contemporary threat to the rule of law comes from within the legal system itself.

Alexis de Tocqueville, author of *Democracy in America* and one of the first writers to observe the United States from the outside looking-in, "described lawyers as a natural aristocracy in America," Jones told the students. "The intellectual basis of their profession and the study of law based on venerable precedents bred in them habits of order and a taste for formalities and predictability." As Tocqueville saw it, "These qualities enabled attorneys to stand apart from the passions of the majority. Lawyers were respected by the citizens and able to guide them and moderate the public's whims. Lawyers were essential to tempering the potential tyranny of the majority.

"Some lawyers may still perceive our profession in this flattering light, but to judge from polls and the tenor of lawyer jokes, I doubt the public shares Tocqueville's view anymore, and it is hard for us to do so.

"The legal aristocracy have shed their professional independence for the temptations and materialism associated with becoming businessmen. Because law has become a self-avowed business, pressure mounts to give clients the advice they want to hear, to pander to the clients' goal through deft manipulation of the law. ... While the business mentality produces certain benefits, like occasional competition to charge clients lower fees, other adverse effects include advertising and shameless self-promotion. The legal

system has also been wounded by lawyers who themselves no longer respect the rule of law."

The judge quoted Kenneth Starr as saying, "It is decidedly unchristian to win at any cost," and added that most lawyers agree with him.

However, "An increasingly visible and vocal number apparently believe that the strategic use of anger and incivility will achieve their aims. Others seem uninhibited about making misstatements to the court or their opponents or destroying or falsifying evidence," she claimed. "When lawyers cannot be trusted to observe the fair processes essential to maintaining the rule of law, how can we expect the public to respect the process?"

Another pernicious development within the legal system is the misuse of lawsuits, according to her.

"We see lawsuits wielded as weapons of revenge," she says. "Lawsuits are brought that ultimately line the pockets of lawyers rather than their clients. ... The lawsuit is not the best way to achieve social justice, and to think it is, is a seriously flawed hypothesis. There are better ways to achieve social goals than by going into court."

Jones said that employment litigation is a particularly fertile field for this kind of abuse.

"Seldom are employment discrimination suits in our court supported by direct evidence of race or sex-based animosity. Instead, the courts are asked to revisit petty interoffice disputes and to infer invidious motives from trivial comments or work-performance criticism. Recrimination, second-guessing and suspicion plague the workplace when tenuous

discrimination suits are filed ... creating an atmosphere in which many corporate defendants are forced into costly settlements because they simply cannot afford to vindicate their positions.

"While the historical purpose of the common law was to compensate for individual injuries, this new litigation instead purports to achieve redistributive social justice. Scratch the surface of the attorneys' self-serving press releases, however, and one finds how enormously profitable social redistribution is for those lawyers who call themselves 'agents of change.'"

Jones wonders, "What social goal is achieved by transferring millions of dollars to the lawyers, while their clients obtain coupons or token rebates."

The judge quoted George Washington who asked in his Farewell Address, "Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths ... in courts of justice?"

Similarly, asked Jones, how can a system founded on law survive if the administrators of the law daily display their contempt for it?

"Lawyers' private morality has definite public consequences," she said. "Their misbehavior feeds on itself, encouraging disrespect and debasement of the rule of law as the public become encouraged to press their own advantage in a system they perceive as manipulatable."

The second threat to the rule of law comes from government, which is encumbered with agencies that have made the law so complicated that it is difficult to decipher and often contradicts itself.

"Agencies have an inherent tendency to expand their mandate," says Jones. "At the same time, their decision-making often becomes parochial and short-sighted. They may be captured by the entities that are ostensibly being regulated, or they may pursue agency self-interest at the expense of the public welfare. Citizens left at the mercy of selective and unpredictable agency action have little recourse."

Jones recommends three books by Philip Howard: *The Death of Common Sense*, *The Collapse of the Common Good* and *The Lost Art of Drawing the Line*, which further delineate this problem.

The third and most comprehensive threat to the rule of law arises from contemporary legal

philosophy.

"Throughout my professional life, American legal education has been ruled by theories like positivism, the residue of legal realism, critical legal studies, post-modernism and other philosophical fashions," said Jones. "Each of these theories has a lot to say about the 'is' of law, but none of them addresses the 'ought,' the moral foundation or direction of law."

Jones quoted Roger C. Cramton, a law professor at Cornell University, who wrote in the 1970s that **"the ordinary religion of the law school classroom" is "a moral relativism tending toward nihilism, a pragmatism tending toward an amoral instrumentalism, a realism tending toward cynicism, an individualism tending toward atomism, and a faith in reason and democratic processes tending toward mere credulity and idolatry."**

The judge said ruefully, "There has been no Great Awakening in the law school classroom since those words were written." She maintained that now it is even worse because faith and democratic processes are breaking down.

"The problem with legal philosophy today is that it reflects all too well the broader post-Enlightenment problem of philosophy," Jones said. She quoted Ernest Fortin, who wrote in *Crisis* magazine: "The whole of modern thought ... has been a series of heroic attempts to reconstruct a world of human meaning and value on the basis of ... our purely mechanistic understanding of the universe."

Jones said that all of these threats to the rule of law have a common thread running through them, and she quoted Professor Harold Berman to identify it: **"The traditional Western beliefs in the structural integrity of law, its ongoingness, its religious roots, its transcendent qualities, are disappearing not only from the minds of law teachers and law students but also from the consciousness of the vast majority of citizens, the people as a whole; and more than that, they are disappearing from the law itself. The law itself is becoming more fragmented, more subjective, geared more to expediency and less morality. ... The historical soil of the Western legal tradition is being washed away ... and the tradition itself is threatened with collapse."**

Judge Jones concluded with

another thought from George Washington: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness - these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens."

Upon taking questions from students, Judge Jones recommended Michael Novak's book, *On Two Wings: Humble Faith and Common Sense*.

"Natural law is not a prescriptive way to solve problems," Jones said. "It is a way to look at life starting with the Ten Commandments."

Natural law provides "a framework for government that permits human freedom," Jones said. "If you take that away, what are you left with? Bodily senses? The will of the majority? The communist view? What is it - 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need?' I don't even remember it, thank the Lord," she said to the amusement of the students.

"I am an unabashed patriot - I think the United States is the healthiest society in the world at this point in time," Jones said, although she did concede that there were other ways to accommodate the rule of law, such as constitutional monarchy.

"Our legal system is way out of kilter," she said. "The tort litigating system is wreaking havoc. Look at any trials that have been conducted on TV. These lawyers are willing to say anything."

Judge Edith Jones has been mentioned as a potential nominee to the Supreme Court in the Bush administration, but does not relish the idea.

"Have you looked at what people have to go through who are nominated for federal appointments? They have to answer questions like, 'Did you pay your nanny taxes?' 'Is your yard man illegal?'"

"In those circumstances, who is going to go out to be a federal judge? People who have accomplished nothing. In other words, federal employees."

Judge Edith H. Jones has a B.A. from Cornell University and a J.D. from the University of Texas School of Law. She was appointed to the Fifth Circuit by President Ronald Reagan in 1985. Her office is in the U.S. Courthouse in Houston.

The Federalist Society was founded in 1982 when a group of law students from Harvard, Stanford, the

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. - Mark Twain

University of Chicago and Yale organized a symposium on federalism at Yale Law School. These students were unhappy with the academic climate on their campuses for some of the reasons outlined by Judge Jones. The Federalist Society was created to be a forum for a wider range of legal viewpoints than they were hearing in the course of their studies.

The Society has more than 150 law school chapters. The Harvard chapter, with over 250 members, is one of the nation's largest and most active. They seek to contribute to civilized dialogue at the Law School by providing a libertarian and conservative voice on campus and by sponsoring speeches and debates on a wide range of legal and policy issues.

The Federalist Society is founded on three principles: 1) the state exists to preserve freedom, 2) the separation of governmental powers is central to our Constitution and 3) it is emphatically the province and duty of the judiciary to state what the law is, not what it should be. -- http://www.massnews.com/2003_Edition/s/3_March/

The FBI's Air Force

WASHINGTON -- The FBI has a fleet of aircraft, some equipped with night surveillance and eavesdropping equipment, flying America's skies to track and collect intelligence from suspected terrorists. The FBI will not provide exact figures on the planes and helicopters, but more than 80 are in the skies. There are several planes, known as "Nightstalkers," equipped with infrared devices that allow agents to track people and vehicles in the dark. Other aircraft are outfitted with electronic surveillance equipment so agents can pursue listening devices placed in cars, in buildings and even along streets, or listen to cell phone calls. Still others fly photography missions, although officials would not describe precise capabilities.

The FBI, which has made counterterrorism its top priority since Sept. 11, 2001, has sharply increased its use of aircraft. "You want to watch activity, and you want to do it discreetly. You don't want to be sitting around in cars," said Weldon Kennedy, a retired FBI deputy director. "Aviation is one way to do that. You don't need to get close to that person at all."

Some critics say the surveillance technology further blurs the boundaries

on domestic spying. They point to a 2001 case in which the Supreme Court found police had engaged in an unreasonable search by using thermal imaging equipment to detect heat lamps used to grow marijuana plants indoors.

All 56 FBI field offices have access to aircraft, piloted by FBI agents who have other investigative duties as well. Most aircraft are propeller-driven civilian models, favored for their relatively slow speed and unobtrusive appearance.

Legally, no warrants are necessary for the FBI to track cars or people from the air. Law enforcement officials need warrants to search homes or to plant listening devices or monitor cell phone calls -- and that includes when the listener is flying in an airplane.

The FBI will not disclose where the planes are being used. This month, however, in the college town of Bloomington, Ind., residents spotted a Cessna aircraft flying overhead at roughly the same times every day for more than a week. After first issuing denials, local FBI agents admitted it was their plane, involved in a terrorism investigation. But FBI officials were quick to say it was not doing electronic eavesdropping. "There should be no concern that the aircraft is doing anything other than assisting with physical surveillance," said FBI agent James Davis.

The FBI has been using airplanes since 1938, when an agent in a Stinson monoplane helped stop an extortion attempt that involved a payoff package thrown from a moving passenger train. The first major deployment happened in 1975 during the investigation of the killings of two FBI agents at the sprawling Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

The program has been particularly useful in investigations of organized crime and drug trafficking. Mobsters who suspected their homes and telephones were bugged frequently held meetings in moving cars, not realizing that bugs also were placed there and were being monitored from the air.

Congress approved this year a \$20 million increase in the FBI's aviation budget but denied a request for two new Black Hawk helicopters. It also ordered the bureau to develop a master plan for its aviation program.

The FBI also can request aviation help from the Defense Department. That can involve a great deal of bureaucracy and care, however, to ensure the military does not violate laws preventing them from doing law enforcement work within the United States. -- AP, March 14, 2003

AOL is working to disarm you!

Make ShootersNet your Internet Service Provider (ISP) and automatically help Citizens Of America. Sign up for \$18.95 a month and \$5.00 a month goes automatically to COA! To see what you get and how to sign up go to: http://www.shootersinet.com/SignUp/National-US/COA/cover_page.htm

"A minute particle of the universal 'one'"

By Erica Carle

For more than a century and a quarter members of a group called the Theosophical Society have been propagandizing and working for a world religion and world government. Their efforts have had more effect on our lives and thinking than most people realize. The Theosophists were clever. Rather than drawing attention to the society itself, they promoted a doctrine of universal brotherhood.

In the June 1945 *Theosophist* magazine appeared "A Declaration of Human Interdependence" by Louis Berman. Berman, chairman of the All Nations Committee for World Unity, wrote:

A restoration of the sense of world-wide human blood kinship must precede the revival of the emotion of human solidarity and the immortal idea of human brotherhood. By the spread of the emotion and idea of human interdependence the morbid divisions of nationalistic segregations and racial schisms will be eliminated from the collective human system. A world organization, based upon an acceptance of universal human unity will then become workable through a world-wide federation of all peoples and states. Such a federation must inevitably be endowed with a supranational sovereignty and enforced by a pooled community of the power of states and groups.

The April 1946 *Theosophist* claimed much of the credit for the establishment of the United Nations:

For seventy years we have filled the world's mind, through our Theosophical propaganda in some 56 countries of the world where our Lodges have been working, with the precisely formulated thought in our First Object: "without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour."... At least it can be said of us that we were pioneers and we did "blaze the trail" which the U.N.O. has followed.

In his State of the Union address on January 27, 1998, President William Jefferson Clinton asserted:

"We are many. We must be one."

Who are you? Do you have an identity, or will you be content to live "without distinction" as a minute particle of the universal "one?"

Homeland Defense, Asphyxiation and Heat Stroke

By Brian Dunaway

Houston press has reported that Lowe's and Home Depot stores throughout Harris County have sold out of the plastic sheeting, duct tape, and other supplies recommended by the Office of Homeland Defense (OHD) in order for citizens to be better prepared in the event of an terrorist act.

According to OHD's ["What to do during a chemical or biological attack"](#) we should "Seek shelter in an internal room, preferably one without windows. Seal the room with duct tape and plastic sheeting. Ten square feet of floor space per person will provide sufficient air to prevent carbon dioxide build-up for up to five hours."

And *Good Morning America's* Home Improvement Editor, Ron Hazelton, assured his viewers, "Don't worry about running out of air. Every ten square feet of floor space will last an adult about 5 hours. And don't leave the room until you get instructions from the Emergency Broadcast System to do so."

But notice the discrepancy in the phrases "to prevent carbon dioxide build-up" and "don't worry about running out of air." ***Hazelton is actually correct (probably accidentally) that the amount of oxygen corresponding to a ten square foot space is probably sufficient (though marginal) to sustain an adult for about five hours, but the critical issue is not oxygen consumption, but carbon dioxide generation and accumulation.*** The

OHD statement is correct in identifying carbon dioxide accumulation as a concern, but its conclusions are surprising, to say the least.

Assuming an eight-foot ceiling (yielding eighty cubic feet per person) and a subject metabolic rate of 800 BTU/hr, after five hours the partial pressure of carbon dioxide (ppCO₂) would be ~67 mm Hg (if the initial ppCO₂ were zero). It cannot be understated: *this is very high.* (Note: 800 BTU/hr (3.36 kcal/min) is not unreasonable for a very excited person in a hot and humid enclosure with elevated carbon dioxide (more on that in a moment). For this case, a bare (but irresponsible) minimum might be 600 BTU/hr (corresponding to a ppCO₂ level of 50 mm Hg after five hours). Consider that NASA Environmental Control and Life Support engineers typically assume a waking metabolic rate of 450 BTU/hr for moderate intravehicular activity, and this is with very physically efficient subjects (astronauts) not using major muscle groups (e.g., legs) in microgravity.)

Keep in mind that the maximum operational limit for the Shuttle Orbiter is 7.6 mm Hg, and is actually lower for the International Space Station. The NASA Spacecraft Maximum Allowable Concentration (SMAC) for carbon dioxide is 10.0 mm Hg for a one-hour period. Similar values can be found among the literature of the various military branches.

The NASA *Bioastronautics Data Book* (Second Edition, pp. 48–49) indicates that after only 80 minutes, at a ppCO₂ level of ~18 mm Hg, the subject can experience "mental depression, headache, dizziness, nausea." At ~45 mm Hg (after 80 minutes), the subject experiences "marked deterioration leading to dizziness and stupor, with inability to take steps for self preservation. The final state is unconsciousness." (The level in our case would not reach 45 mm Hg after 80 minutes, but the threshold of the aforementioned symptoms would be at a much lower CO₂ level at the end of five hours.)

The W.E. Kuriger Associates web page titled ["Carbon Dioxide Fact Book,"](#) states that, "Several studies have indicated that CO₂ does not seriously impact human health until levels reach approximately 15,000 ppm [7.5 mm Hg]. ... At extremely high levels, i.e.,

30,000 ppm [15 mm Hg] (these concentrations are usually never reached in a standard home), the symptoms can include nausea, dizziness, mental depression, shaking, visual disturbances and vomiting. At extremely high levels, loss of consciousness may occur. ... Finally, CO₂ is an asphyxiate, a condition in which an extreme decrease in the amount of oxygen in the body, accompanied by an increase of carbon dioxide, leads to loss of consciousness or death. Concentrations of 100,000 ppm [50 mm Hg] or more of CO₂ can produce unconsciousness or death.

And carbon dioxide is hardly the only physiological concern. One would probably pass out from heat exhaustion before he passed out from exposure to high carbon dioxide concentrations.

It's probably not a bad assumption to consider the system adiabatic (no heat transfer – there would be very little heat transfer via conduction, which is the only mechanism for heat transfer to the environment in this scenario), and considering the thermal capacitance of the subject (the thermal capacitance of the surrounding air is only about 1% of that of the subject), suffice to say that the subject would have very serious core temperature problems long before five hours time (a three, four degree elevation per hour?)

And within about ten to fifteen minutes after being in this enclosure the air would become saturated, that is, 100% relative humidity (and condensate would start forming on the plastic). As the air temperature and humidity increases (deteriorating the mechanisms for rejecting the subject's metabolic heat), and carbon dioxide levels increase, and as oxygen is depleted (at the end of five hours, at 800 BTU/hr the subject would be at an altitude equivalency of ~19,000 feet (0.47 atm.), at 600 BTU/hr ~14,000 feet (0.60 atm.)), his metabolic rate will increase, in turn increasing the metabolic heat and perspired and respired water vapor he generates, creating a vicious cycle. -- And, of course, children and elderly can withstand much less of this kind of environment than adults.

Perhaps the worst aspect of the dissemination of this information is that the balance of the press, including

network news broadcasters, *didn't even mention a time limit at all.*

Other aspects of the OHD statement are very odd – how many folks are wealthy enough to have an inside room with no windows (other than a closet, which would, according to their recommendations, only be sufficient for one person)?

And plastic sheeting? That's awfully vague. Surely there are permeability and robustness issues here.

Considering that only a very tiny proportion of the population (and obviously no one at the Office of Homeland Security) are trained to make these calculations and decisions, and remembering that a significant portion of the population doesn't know their "right hand from their left," may God bless them, the instructions from the OHD are cause for very serious concern.

So *please* give this wide circulation – there is a high likelihood that there are plenty of folks *already* out there sitting in an enclosure that they believe to be safe, unknowingly endangering the lives of themselves and their children.

John Lott Replies to Critics

Ed.: last month we printed NJ Assemblywoman Loretta Weinberg's (Dist. 37) assertion that Lott's findings in his book *More Guns Less Crime* are "fundamentally flawed." The exchange between a NJ militia supporter and Lott follows:

Hi again, John.

An associate of mine has a friend who is also engaging NJ Assemblyman Loretta Weinberg on her claim that your research is "fundamentally flawed".

Are you able, without great effort, to share with me citations (and any URLs) in which you responded to and/or rebutted the citations Weinberg provides?

HH
Mercer County

Dear H:

Thanks for your e-mail. Below is some information that I think would help. Let me know if you need anything else.

Regards,
John Lott (jlott@aei.org)

I have two books on the subject that you might find of some help. A new book entitled *The Bias*

Against Guns deals extensively with the debate (Appendix 1 goes through many of the papers you list in detail): http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0895261146/qid=1040595070/sr=1-2/ref=sr_1_2/104-0527115-7395135?v=glance&s=books

See also chapter 9 as well as chp. 7 in *More Guns, Less Crime* (make sure it is the second edition, 2000):

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/A/SIN/0226493644/104-0527115-7395135>

Here are seven journal articles in just one journal that find similar results to what I found in my paper with David Mustard and my book:

<http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/JLE/journal/contents/v44nS2.html>

Some papers that respond to a couple of the articles listed in the e-mail that you sent, though the books go through this points as well as other papers in more detail:

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=320102

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=320107

Five Reasons

By a Christian Patriot

Ed.: this article was written before Gulf War II began. We'll let our readers judge its merit -- even as our constitutionally ignorant soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are once again engaged in an undeclared (illegal) war.

There are five reasons that any self respecting "patriot" should not even think about joining the military.

1) When you join, you are required to take an oath that you will obey their orders. If those orders conflict with your conscience, well sin loy victor charlie (translation: tough crap v.c.) And with the Patriot Act, Homeland Security, etc. all in place - ALL EXACTING COROLLARIES TO HITLER'S NEW WORLD ORDER, you would be nothing less than a modern day SS soldier or a Gestapo agent.

2) Some try to convince us they are joining to have inside information and training from the military... and they try to hint that they will get some mil spec goodies for themselves and their friends as a side benefit of the job. Who are they trying to convince... us or themselves? Did you notice that my first two objections go directly to the issue of lying to yourself?

3) People in the military will be the first to be forced to accept microchips as ID, take questionable vaccines not to mention be the paid assassins against all those Americans who choose to reject the Mark of the Beast, gun confiscation, National ID, etc. And WHEN these guys are ordered to fire upon their militia brethren - or even their own blood relatives.... watch the movie Schindler's List.

4) The current military is the private army of one George Bush, head of the United States, INCORPORATED. He is NOT the President of the country that our forefathers envisioned when they penned the Constitution. Matter of FACT, the Constitution has as about as much relevance as a roll of toilet paper in Bush's New World Order (read the Patriot Act and Homeland Security as proof of that.)

5). The wise are guided by this statement: "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Jesus himself, said that in Matt. 6:24.

By his own admission, GW Bush, the "commander in chief" of the armed forces does NOT believe in the same God as the Christian Americans who make up the patriot community. The aforementioned legislation is evidence that refutes any claims Bush can make to the contrary. So, it does not add up that anyone who is a Christian or a patriot would take an oath that is contrary to what they believe in (or say they believe in) as a Christian / patriot.

History 101 – Mid-term exam

By historian William Blum

In the answer to this simple test you will find the value of bombing Iraq.

This test consists of one (1) multiple-choice question (so you better get it right!) Here's a list of the countries that the U.S. has bombed since the end of World War II:

China	1945-46
Korea	1950-53
China	1950-53
Guatemala	1954
Indonesia	1958
Cuba	1959-60
Guatemala	1960
Congo	1964
Peru	1965
Laos	1964-73
Vietnam	1961-73
Cambodia	1969-70
Guatemala	1967-69

Grenada	1983
Libya	1986
El Salvador	1980s
Nicaragua	1980s
Panama	1989
Iraq	1991-99
Sudan	1998
Afghanistan	1998
Yugoslavia	1999

NOW HERE IS THE QUESTION: In how many of these instances did a FREE government, respectful of human rights, occur as a direct result? Choose one of the following:

- (a) 0
- (b) zero
- (c) none
- (d) not a one
- (e) a whole number between -1 and +1

Woman won't eat until feds answer tax questions

In a move reminiscent of tax-reform activist Bob Schulz's hunger strike in 2001, a 52-year-old woman has vowed not to eat save for taking Holy Communion until the federal government agrees to answer certain questions about the federal income tax system.

Rose Lear of Muskegon, Mich., has gone without food since March 4 and says she is willing to die unless the government comes through, according to a statement from Schulz's organization, We the People <<http://www.givemeliberty.org/>>.

"What else can I do?" said Lear in the statement. "I have tried everything else. Congressman [Pete] Hoekstra [R-Mich.] and State Senator VanWoerkom refuse to answer the questions. The IRS and the U.S. Department of Justice refuse to answer the questions. Attorneys are afraid to raise the questions in court for fear of being sanctioned or disbarred.

"More and more people are learning about the legal evidence but are being abused by the courts, which appear to be in collusion with the IRS. Something is going terribly wrong with the justice system in America. We need

to get to the truth," said Lear.

The questions to which Lear refers concern various contentions made by the "tax honesty movement," including that the 16th Amendment authorizing income tax was not properly ratified and that the federal IRS code does not require that Americans pay income tax.

According to the We the People website, Lear's husband, William Wallace Lear, recently was convicted for willfully failing to file an income tax return. He was scheduled to begin a one-year sentence in federal prison last Monday.

In the case of Schulz, he ended a 20-day hunger strike in 2001 after IRS and Justice Department officials agreed to meet with him to answer his questions. Government officials later reneged, and We the People held its own congressional-hearing style forum in Washington, D.C. At the event, several expert tax attorneys and former IRS officials "testified" that the income tax was illegal, improperly levied and burdensome to Americans.

According to the statement, Lear is 5 feet, 4 inches tall and weighs 100 pounds. She has placed a large sign in the picture window of her home, which reads: "Congressman Hoekstra: No Answers No Taxes No Food."

Former IRS special agent Joseph Banister, who runs the website [freedomabovefortune.com](http://www.freedomabovefortune.com/), has solicited support for Lear via e-mail, asking that people post signs in their windows in solidarity with the activist.

He also asks e-mail recipients to "pray for Rose and her husband, Bill, and pray that appropriate government officials do something to reverse the injustices perpetrated against them."

The "Care Act of 2003"

I was just saying how the IRS cheats. Here is a fine example of what CONGRESS is once again trying to pass into law. Keep in mind, the Constitution (Fifth Amendment) says that no one can be deprived of property

without "DUE PROCESS OF LAW."

Here is what your "representatives" think of due process: <http://www.house.gov/jct/x-4-03.pdf>

Scroll down to page 100, and look where it talks about "frivolous" arguments. Here is how it works. If you file a tax return that cites what THE LAW ITSELF says about determining taxable income (i.e. Section 861 and its regulations), there would be a five THOUSAND dollar fine (instead of the current five hundred dollar fine).

But wait, it gets better. The IRS can declare ANY issue to be "frivolous," and FINE you thousands of dollars for bringing it up. But wait... there's more...

It isn't just for tax returns any more. If you ask for a Collections Due Process Hearing... \$5000 fine. If you request a "Taxpayer Assistance Order," \$5000 fine. For these and a couple other administrative procedure steps, your request will be discarded and ignored, and then you will be robbed. (If you go to Tax Court, you then get fined up to \$25,000.)

It is now ILLEGAL to file a CORRECT tax return, and ILLEGAL to cite the LAW to argue it. Nice due process, huh? I hope you feel well served.

(P.S. They call it the "Care Act of 2003." I kid you not.)

"Rewards" Program

Rewards for justice gives us millions of additional pairs of eyes and ears to be on the lookout. It puts potential informants in every place a terrorist might try to hide or operate in. And it works. — Colin Powell, Secretary of State and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

-- from the web page of the thought police

http://www.dssrewards.net/english/rewards_program/Rewards_Pgm_in dex.htm

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone (____) _____ E-mail _____